

## COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

**April 1, 2002**

**6:00 PM**

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Wihby, Shea, Smith, Lopez

Messrs: R. MacKenzie, K. Neil, B. Tremblay, Chief Kane, Deputy Chief Monnelly, Aldermen Garrity, DeVries, Gatsas, Thibault

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Discussion of FY2003 CIP budget and communications:

Chairman O'Neil stated just for review we are scheduled to hold a public hearing on the CIP budget on April 10 at 7 PM here in the Chambers.

- a) communication from Alderman Garrity requesting funding for the Manchester Boys & Girls Club

Alderman Wihby stated we got the CIP budget from the Mayor and all it pretty much says is what he funded but it doesn't give us what it was last year and what was actually requested and all of those numbers that we usually get. Can we have that so we know what he didn't fund and what he did fund and what was funded last year? Maybe last year's request, last year's funded, this year's request and this year's funded.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes we can get you a summary and if you would like we can just mail it out to the members as soon as we get it put together.

Alderman Wihby stated you should probably send it to everybody.

Mr. MacKenzie asked the full Board.

Alderman Wihby answered yes. Are items a-d on the CIP budget now?

Mr. MacKenzie stated on Item b I know the Fire Department was looking for \$15,000. The Mayor's proposal does have \$10,000 for that. On Item c, that is the inner city terminal and there is funding for that.

Alderman Wihby asked so that is in the budget already.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes and I don't think there is funding for Item d, the Pearl Street Parking Lot.

Alderman Lopez stated I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, I do have a recommendation and I know that we are going to get into the 2003 budget whereby whatever action we take tonight...I would like to bring up something that possibly could help us in the CIP especially with some of these projects here. I know I was talking to the HR Director and we need another \$20,000 and I am sure everybody needs something but I think one of the items that I would like to put on the table is the transfer from some line items to take care of Parks & Recreation number one and if we do that then we have \$65,000 to take care of two or three items along with some other things in the FY03 budget that we can look at. I think without finding or transferring some money from bonds that have been sitting around since 1996 and the area I am speaking of is...my recommendation to solve the Parks problem is to take \$150,000 from 128898...

Chairman O'Neil interjected before you go on, what problem is there with Parks.

Alderman Lopez replied the problem with Parks is that we have \$65,000 Cash in FY03 but he will not be able to spend that until July and in order to get Gill Stadium in shape naturally you need a lot more money and if you wait until July then the baseball season is practically over and we still have the same problem.

Chairman O'Neil asked so you are talking about the pigeon situation at Gill Stadium.

Alderman Lopez answered not necessarily just the pigeon situation but the overall Gill Stadium and I think Ron Ludwig can probably speak to it better than I but there are the bleachers and the stands, the entrance, the men's room and all different things that Gill Stadium needs. We right now have \$752,000 sitting in the computer fund; money that has not been used since 1996. My recommendation is to do this so we can get Parks on the road. They are ready to go. They are ready for construction. They are ready to do everything tomorrow. They cannot wait until July. I think if we can solve this problem and we can move the money and take \$150,000 from that account and transfer it to Parks and let Parks get out on the road and get going then that will release \$65,000 that we have in the FY03 budget and then we can do...I know we have the Boy's Club coming up and we

could allocate some money there. HR needs a little bit and there will probably be \$15,000 or \$20,000 left. I am just asking this Board to consider and Mr. MacKenzie or Sam can probably speak to this but my figures indicate \$752,000 and the account in 1996 has \$186,000, in 1997 it has \$67,000, in 1998 it has \$451,000 and in 1999 it has \$46,000. They have not been able to provide the Accounts Committee as of yet and I know of no plan to spend all of this money so with your permission if you would let Bob MacKenzie or Sam speak to this I think this is a solution and if we solve this problem by problem I think we can get through this.

Alderman Wihby asked where is the \$65,000 Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez answered it is under City Cash, Section 3, 510403. Normally he gets about \$80,000 a year and they threw another \$65,000 in there for Gill Stadium.

Alderman Wihby asked so out of \$140,000 Cash it is \$65,000 that you are talking about.

Alderman Lopez answered yes.

Alderman Wihby asked and what is the other thing you are talking about. All of those accounts are for what?

Alderman Lopez answered all of those accounts that I am speaking of are not listed in here because there is no money this year given to them. These accounts are previous bonds that we have issued and there are no plans that I know of to use the money. It was for City computer upgrades. The biggest one is \$451,000 in 1998. That is as of February 28 this year that there were those balances in those accounts.

Alderman Wihby asked but that was bonds and not cash.

Alderman Lopez answered that is bonded money. As you are well aware the reason we use cash is because I believe if it is less than \$100,000 or \$75,000 we like to use cash but if we use \$150,000 to give to Parks I think that we can solve a lot of problems in this CIP budget.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we have tracked those particular accounts over the last couple of years because as you did indicate they have not expended all of the money. They have pretty much committed the money for projects, although not encumbered necessarily. They do have purposes for that in implementing the computer system. I was just talking with Sam and they may not necessarily need

the money for the balance of this fiscal year but they do ultimately need that money in perhaps a subsequent fiscal year. It may be possible...I think the amount that you discussed, \$150,000, you are correct. If you were doing smaller improvements at Gill Stadium for \$65,000 let's say, that is probably not bondable but the \$150,000 you discussed would be a possibility to use an existing bond balance such as the computer system.

Alderman Lopez stated I think it is very important for the Committee to vote in favor of this because that can solve some of our other problems as I indicated as we go into FY03. Without doing something like this, it is going to be very, very difficult to help out and add \$5,000 or \$10,000 or whatever the case may be. If the Fire Department is looking for another \$5,000 we surely can give them another \$5,000 out of the \$65,000 and take care of the Boy's Club and take care of HR.

Alderman Wihby asked is Ron Ludwig here. The \$150,000, what would you do with that at Gill? Is that your number?

Mr. Ludwig answered we are working very aggressively to get the pigeon problem taken care of.

Alderman Wihby asked how much is that going to be.

Mr. Ludwig answered the other issue we have is that in Section M, I believe, which is the furthest section of the grandstand on the Maple Street side, we opened up a huge hole in the fall and we definitely committed to going in and replacing some very large beams in there and getting it done. This I was just going to have to try and take from the Enterprise about \$50,000 worth of repair work.

Alderman Wihby asked so what is the total that you will be using there you think for everything you just mentioned.

Mr. Ludwig answered again the expense of the structural work on the decking of the grandstand at Gill is probably never ending. We have taken a close look at it now and we think that Section A is probably similar to Section M given the proximity to the outside elements that come in on both ends of the ballpark, which are most suspect to rapid deterioration. When we open Section M we have to take out half of the section next to it just to be able to tie in properly and do the job structurally correct. It is kind of open ended to some degree. There is some interest in doing a little fix up on the sidewalks on the outside of the ballpark as well, which had some crack sealing done several years ago. The Highway Department was nice enough to come along and do it, but it really shouldn't have been done on a sidewalk because it never really blended in like it would on a street when you are going over it with tires all the time. There is some interest in doing

some overlaying and trying to make the front of the ballpark look a little bit nicer as well. That is where we would use the balance of the money.

Alderman Wihby asked is Gill in the Enterprise fund.

Mr. Ludwig answered Gill has always been in the Enterprise with really no ability to generate revenue for large capital projects. That is the issue with Gill.

Alderman Wihby asked so it doesn't generate any revenue.

Mr. Ludwig answered no.

Chairman O'Neil asked could you just run by those numbers again. We know the netting and painting is \$65,000 correct?

Mr. Ludwig answered that is right.

Chairman O'Neil asked how much for the structural repairs.

Mr. Ludwig answered again we are into Section M. I figure about \$50,000.

Chairman O'Neil asked how about to overlay the sidewalks.

Mr. Ludwig answered my approach depending on the money we had left...if you back into that we will maybe get Frank or somebody to help us with the overlay so it would be a little less.

Alderman Lopez stated Frank Thomas did say he would do that and it will run anywhere from \$3,500 to \$4,500 if you just do an overlay but if you do it properly it would probably run somewhere around \$7,000 to \$9,000.

Chairman O'Neil replied that doesn't add up to \$150,000. I only have \$115,000 right now.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree with you. I said take the \$150,000 and whatever is left I think there is another area that we can include in there and that is Prouts Park because we have \$100,000 shortfall at Prouts Park.

Chairman O'Neil replied I want to go back to what Alderman Lopez said. Even though the money is not needed now you say it could be needed in the future so we will be stealing from Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. MacKenzie stated they do have projects earmarked at Information Systems. Some of those final price tags are still up in the air. For example, ultimately converting our hand drawn Assessor's records into digital records, which should find additional tax base when they do that and save money but that has been a fairly wide estimation in the cost of actually converting it. That could be anywhere from \$200,000 to \$400,000. It is a little premature to determine how much they will ultimately need for that conversion project. So ultimately they will need the money but they probably don't need it in the next 12 months.

Chairman O'Neil asked is it possible to get something from Diane Prew. You can get from Alderman Lopez what he is suggesting and let Diane know to make sure that she doesn't have any commitments.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have no problem doing it if there is money sitting around, but I hate to take money if there are contracts pending.

Mr. MacKenzie replied for some of the money there are contracts pending, but not all of the money. We could get a response from Diane on that.

Alderman Lopez stated could I ask if the Committee would go along with this and not hold it up. If Mr. MacKenzie does find the \$150,000 can he proceed and do what is necessary to get it before the Board so that Parks & Recreation...they are ready to roll tomorrow. I am fighting for them and everybody else. I would like to move that we take \$150,000 out of those projects if it is not contracted.

Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby stated where I have my problem is it is \$115,000 so I can see fixing Gill Stadium I guess because I know it needs it and maybe taking that money out for now knowing that we are going to have to put it back in the following year. I don't have a problem with that. The other \$35,000, if it is not earmarked for Gill Stadium I guess I don't know where we are going to put it. My concern is that we had departments put in a list with their top priorities and we don't even know what those top priorities are. I assume that Bob can get us that but I don't know if there is something in there where Ron said he needed \$30,000 more to do some other facility before he does something else with the \$35,000. That is my concern. Without having anything in front of us...it is nice to take care of projects but we also have to realize that we are trying to get the rate down so if we save \$65,000 on Cash we could use that to reduce the tax rate rather than go and fund additional items. In the meantime, for the other \$35,000 I would just like to see the top priorities.

Alderman Shea replied with the same reasoning we can cut down all of the expenditures we have as well. We are spending quite a bit of money through different expenditures. There are expenditures...particularly I am concerned about Prouts Park. That was a four-year project. We spend \$350,000 of a reported \$600,000 and I am asking to complete that project, which is three years in the making. What I am saying in essence is if there is available money we should use that money for necessary improvements. If we use the reasoning of Alderman Wihby and we cut back on the tax rate, let's cut back on all of the projects then because some of the money that we are spending, large sums of money, are not going for different projects but for specific projects. The reasoning should be that we should look at all of the City projects and work as best we can to complete projects that are ongoing as well as help other projects that may not have begun but are necessary.

Chairman O'Neil stated one of the things and I think we are going to have the Fire Department up shortly but their original request...

Alderman Shea interjected there was a motion made. Do we want to vote on that motion?

Chairman O'Neil stated I would like to make a point here before the motion is made. They originally requested \$3 million to do the fire station. This year I know the Mayor met with them and I met with them on another occasion and said money is going to be tight. They went back and worked with the architect. Everyone sharpened their pencil and they have that fire station now down to about \$2.2 million limiting their request this year to about \$700,000. My point being that with every project going on in the City of Manchester we have to stretch our dollar and we have to get creative. I was pleased to hear Ron say he would talk to Frank about doing the sidewalks at Gill Stadium. I know that Ron is going to be talking to him about some other things like the work at Derryfield that Frank may be able to do in house and maybe the sidewalks at West Memorial. Again, stretching our dollar and getting more projects or allowing us to move some money into some other projects. That is what we really need to do here. We do not have enough money to take care of all the requests and we need the departments to work very hard to stretch the dollar, especially this year, on our capital dollars.

Alderman Smith stated I initiated Gill Stadium and I did it for sanitary reasons. I realize that the money wasn't available and they said they would put it in the budget for FY03 but can't we wait a week or two. I can understand where most of the Aldermen are coming from but we can get a better picture as to what we are going to cut. There are a lot of things that we are going to cut and a lot of things

are going to change and I don't think a week or two will make that much difference in the construction season.

Alderman Wihby stated I agree with Alderman Smith. What we are trying to do is...I have no problems with fixing Gill Stadium. I have no problem with taking the \$65,000 out of the other project and saving the \$65,000 in the budget and seeing what we want to do with it. I agree with Alderman Shea. If we have gone ahead and done some projects and we need somebody to finish a project, absolutely those should be done first. My concern is I don't know if it is the top priority or not. That is my concern. There might be another park that is already started that should almost be done and with \$35,000 it might be able to be done whereas we are not going to get that done but start Prouts Park. If it is not, that is fine but until we get that list...I don't know why we can't just wait until we get the list and find out what was asked for and what the top priorities of all the departments were and then if we have that available money, go ahead and do that. I think we are making a mistake by voting all this stuff in and sending this up to the full Board to vote not even knowing where our budget is going to end up.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Bob, how long will it take to get all of that together. By Friday?

Mr. MacKenzie answered we will get the summaries to you this week, probably Friday and we will get the letter from Diane hopefully Friday or Monday.

Chairman O'Neil stated we are having a public hearing a week from Wednesday on the CIP budget so we could take any actions up after that public hearing.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Shea asked don't we have a CIP meeting on April 8.

Chairman O'Neil answered I think the date is April 10 now for the public hearing.

Alderman Shea replied not the public hearing but prior to the public hearing don't we have another CIP meeting.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I believe there is one scheduled on April 8 but I don't have the calendar. I would have to check that for you.

Chairman O'Neil stated we had thrown a lot of dates out.

Alderman Shea stated there is a CIP meeting on Tuesday, April 9 at 5:30 PM.



Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I think we put it down for regular CIP business and for continued review of the budget.

Chairman O'Neil stated the intent of that was for the regular business of CIP and if there were changes we needed to make to the budget we could do it at that time. Also, remember we got the CIP later than first thought.

Alderman Shea stated well if we got that information on Monday we could discuss it at the meeting on Tuesday.

Chairman O'Neil replied we theoretically could but I agree with Alderman Smith and Alderman Wihby. We shouldn't be doing anything tonight until we find out exactly where we are.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't think we are doing anything tonight. All we are doing is authorizing Bob MacKenzie to go and find \$150,000 if there are no contracts and I am willing to wait a week. I think we are trying to solve all of the problems at once and I don't think we can do that. After the public hearing if we can take action on something like this, Alderman Wihby might be correct about saving \$65,000 and lowering the tax but I think once we get the whole request of the CIP and what they asked for I think you are going to see just like we have seen in the past twice as much as the Mayor put in his budget. There are some priorities like another \$5,000 for the Fire Department is all right and the Boy's Club, a little money there. HR has been shortchanged and I am sure a lot of other places have been shortchanged. I think if it is okay with you, Mr. Chairman, I think that a motion is in order to have Mr. MacKenzie do this and then report back to us as to what he has found.

Chairman O'Neil asked so that is what the motion is then. It is not necessarily to do it but to look into doing it.

Chairman O'Neil stated so the motion is to have staff look at balances and see what money we can transfer. Alderman Lopez, if you can provide the information you have to staff, that would be appreciated.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Shea stated I am not sure if this is an appropriate time to bring this up but we have several non-profits appearing before us, Mr. Chairman, and we really don't have...we know how much they are but do we ever get a report as to what goes towards administrative costs for these non-profits? In other words, there are numerous non-profits that I have before me and when we contribute do we know

whether these particular items that we approved as a Board, do they go for administrative costs or a combination of administrative costs and support? For instance, and I am just using this as an example, if we were to have an idea as to how much goes for administrative costs to administer that program, which is a non-profit program and how much actually goes in terms of helping the boys and girls of Manchester. This is something that we never really get an idea of. Is there any way we can do that? Any way a list can be provided?

Mr. MacKenzie stated we do follow-up after the fact and get their annual reports to determine how much of their total funds are used for administrative and which are direct services. We do know they are designated for very specific programs like repairing a roof on a non-profit organization or helping with the teen center but others are more generalized and we call them operations. Typically, the City money is just a small piece of what are larger monies that they get. We could ask for that information if the Board wanted us to.

Alderman Shea replied I think it is important, Bob, because no one would begrudge anyone receiving money but if people in the non-profit areas are adding staff because we are giving more money to them then obviously maybe they have had in the past we are not really contributing taxpayer's money directly to what we intend to support and I think that is important. If you look through the list there are many wonderful things, obviously, but we have no grasp in terms of whether they are adding extra personnel or cutting back. I would want some kind of report and I think members of the Board would like that because we really have no grasp as far as that is concerned. You said that you could provide that to us before the fact rather than after the fact.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that will take a little bit longer to do. We will have to contact all of the agencies and get some estimates of their administrative costs. What you do have to realize, though, and you discussed the Boy's and Girl's Club is that the money they are asking for is to go to the people to run the operation. I don't know if you consider those administrative costs. They are actually going to pay the employees to work with the kids so that is technically...there is a difference between direct costs and indirect costs. It is still administrative because they are paying employees to work with the kids but you are getting a direct service. You are getting operations to help the kids because you can't run it without people.

Alderman Shea replied well let's assume that they asked for \$25,000. You would say they can add one administrator. If we give them \$50,000 they could add three administrators. Is that what you are saying in essence?

Mr. MacKenzie stated we did meet with the Boy's and Girl's Club. They are looking for over \$100,000 to run the operation of which they were hoping to get \$65,000 from the City. When you say administrative staff, there are people who work with the kids every day and those are direct service providers because you need people to supervise the children. If you are saying how much is going to secretarial or the director of the operation, I think that is more what I would call administrative costs but most of the money they requested goes directly to salaries of the people supervising the children.

Chairman O'Neil stated so that would be direct services then. That is not administrative.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that is more direct services than administrative.

Alderman Thibault stated there is just one thing I would like to bring up to this Committee and I am sure that many of you know this. The kids that go to the Boy's and Girl's Club are not the kids that are causing the problems on our City streets, in our parks and all of these other places. This is a place where kids go in order to have a meaningful program directed to them and their problems. I appreciate what Bob is saying and he is right and I am sure Alderman O'Neil is right and Alderman Shea in asking where the money goes. I think that is a good point and I think they should be asked to say well 25% goes for administrative or 20% or whatever it is but I think you have to look at the bigger picture here. These kids are not the kids who are out in the City streets causing problems. I think we have to look at the big picture here and realize that these programs keep kids away from problems that we have in this City. That is all I would like to say.

Alderman Garrity stated my intent of putting a memo out was just to get some discussion on it. I realize that CIP is a long process and I am a rookie on the Board and still learning myself but if anybody has any questions about the Club or anything like that...Alderman Shea there is very little fluff over there. I spent 12 or 14 years over there of my childhood and there is very little fluff. I think it really is a positive place for kids and it is structured programs. They have lost some of their funding through the other agencies and they haven't asked CIP before and I think it is probably time that the City step up and try to do something. I think the \$50,000 that they asked for through the Mayor's process is probably unrealistic but I think it is important that we try to do what we can at this time.

Alderman Wihby stated I think everybody realizes that the Boy's and Girl's Club has a place in Manchester and they do a great job. I think I am still a trustee, actually. The process is that in the past in the CIP budget we usually wait until we have the public hearing, we listen to people...first of all we are sitting with...there might be a project that we funded for five years that the Mayor didn't fund or cut

in half and we don't know if that is true or not sitting here today. We haven't got those sheets so we should wait to fund something until after we get those sheets. Normally at the public hearing that is when we get these requests. Five or six people, ten people, a hundred people whatever it is, one person gets up and says we have a good program here and the Board realizes that. Normally in the past we haven't had any problem with funding these things. With Alderman Lopez's suggestion about the bonds we could pick up some money there. That helps us with bonding and we have \$65,000 in cash that we could go further and do something with afterwards. I guess I would like to see these things come and be presented at a public hearing where we listen to everybody's concerns, see what was funded and what wasn't funded over the past years and then go from there. I know that in the past we never had any arguments with funding good causes. We have come through even if we had to raise the CIP rate we did that. My recommendation for all of these would be for them to come forward at a public hearing and present it with all the other requests that we are going to have and see what was funded and what wasn't and continue from there and if we want to add some new items or some new programs we could do it after the CIP budget.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would entertain a motion to refer this request to staff for review because there may be some sources of funding other than Cash that may be appropriate and secondly that we refer this to the continued ongoing deliberations with the CIP FY03 budget.

Alderman Shea moved to refer the request from the Boy's and Girl's Club to City staff for review and to the continued ongoing deliberations of the FY03 CIP budget. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Smith asked has this been funded before by CIP.

Chairman O'Neil answered no.

Alderman Smith asked how much did the United Way cut your budget.

Mr. Ken Neil stated I am the Director of Operations at the Club and seated next to me is Brian Tremblay who is our Resource Development Director. As I understand it, the United Way process is still ongoing and has not made final allocations but my understanding is that they are looking at about a 25% decrease in allocable monies from last year. In our situation, that could be a \$20,000 to \$40,000 decrease in funding from the United Way depending on what their final allocation is. That process isn't really finalized until late in the fiscal year. The Boy's and Girl's Club has not received any CIP funding to date. Just to address the administrative costs that Alderman Shea was mentioning, the total budget for the West side club house, which was started last year on Kelley Street as I put in

our CIP presentation was \$132,000 and \$18,000 of that total budget was earmarked towards administrative expenses and the rest were all direct service salaries, equipment, supplies and those type of things to run the program.

Alderman Shea asked what did the United Way give you in 2001. I know you got \$185,000 in 2000. Do you know what you got in 2001?

Mr. Brian Tremblay answered I believe it was \$176,000.

Alderman Shea asked and you said that the West Side is a year old. This would make it two years.

Mr. Neil answered this current year is our second year. We are asking for funding for the third year of that program.

Alderman Shea asked and in the first year you said you spent \$132,000 for upgrading the facility.

Mr. Neil answered no. The operating budget proposed for the next fiscal year for that program is \$132,000 of which we are asking the City for \$50,000 to support that.

Mr. Tremblay stated the program was previously supported through start-up money through the Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance and that was meant a start-up money with the intention of finding sustainable funding locally.

Alderman Shea asked so to make it clear the first year of it, \$132,000 came from the Federal government and of that amount \$18,000 was for administrative costs and this year the amount that you are asking for for administrative costs is how much.

Mr. Neil answered again, the proposal for the next fiscal year is \$132,000. To go back to last year, I don't have those figures but it would be somewhat in that ballpark or a little bit less. In that budget there was \$18,000 earmarked for administrative expenses for the program.

Alderman Shea stated I am confused. Last year it was \$18,000 or this year it is going to be \$18,000?

Mr. Neil replied proposed for next fiscal year, which is what we are asking for the \$50,000 for.

Alderman Shea asked you are asking for \$50,000 and \$18,000 is for administrative costs or the \$50,000 is for administrative costs.

Mr. Neil answered we are asking for \$50,000 towards the overall budget of \$132,000. We will find funding from other sources like the United Way, etc. Of that \$132,000 total budget for the club, that is what it costs to operate that club, we have earmarked within that budget \$18,000 for administrative expenses.

Alderman Shea asked and the rest of it would go towards...

Mr. Neil interjected direct services.

Alderman Smith asked this is for your facility on the West Side.

Mr. Neil answered yes on Kelley Street, 305 Kelley Street. We lease the St. John the Baptist Parish Center, which was formally the Brown Middle School facility.

Alderman Smith asked how many members to you address now, both boys and girls.

Mr. Neil answered to date we have 201 members of that facility. Ninety-nine from Parkside and the other 102 from the three elementary schools on the West Side – Gossler, Parker-Varney and Northwest. The average daily attendance there is about 90 kids of those 201 total members.

Chairman O'Neil asked you said something about the Brown School.

Mr. Neil answered that is where the Club is located. I think it was formally Brown Middle School.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the City leased the St. Jean's building and it was called the Brown Annex. It wasn't the Brown School.

Mr. Neil replied I get confused. There is the one on Amory Street but it is not that one. It is 305 Kelley Street and it was leased by the City at one point.

Chairman O'Neil stated we had a motion made and seconded to refer this to staff to review and that it be part of our ongoing deliberations with the CIP budget. You guys should come to the public hearing and it would be helpful if you could provide ahead of time the number of young people that you are serving and get that to the City Clerk who will get it out to all of the Aldermen.

Alderman Shea stated I used to work at the Boy's Club when it was at the corner of Beech and Hanover Street when Mr. Bricker was in charge. How many people do you have on the East Side and how do you support that? You have more kids on the East Side than the West Side don't you? Where do you get the funding for that?

Mr. Neil stated our total overall membership to date this year is 1,015. We have our main clubhouse, which is the one on Union Street. We also run an after school program at Highland Goffe's Falls and Jewett Street Schools and we have a first and second grade program for 75 kids in the former VNA building on the corner of Walnut and Concord Streets. Our funding stream or funding base is the United Way, endowments, fundraising, and bingo. Anyway that we can get money.

Alderman Shea asked do people have to pay any kind of tuition.

Mr. Neil answered it is \$25 for a youngster to be a member for the year.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to refer Item a to City staff and to continued deliberations of the FY03 CIP budget. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

- b) communication from Frank Thomas, Public Works Director, in support of the Fire Department's request for funding of the clean-up/mitigation of hazardous material spills

Chairman O'Neil asked Chief Kane and Deputy Chief Monnelly to come forward. You requested \$15,000 and the Mayor has suggested \$10,000. Are you in a position to talk about that tonight?

Chief Kane stated originally this project started a few years ago when we had a problem with hazardous waste being dumped around the City and the City ended up managing it. The money that we were getting to manage it and when I say manage it I mean pick it up and haul it away, was coming from Risk Management. There was an audit done of Risk Management and they said that they shouldn't be doing that with the money anymore and there was no funding stream to handle the hazardous waste. We had an incident on the West Side underneath the Kelley Street bridge that we were able to work with one of the waste haulers to get out and Risk Management said that was the last time they were going to utilize the money. Our next incident was up off of Silver Street, I believe, where we had some hazardous waste located in one of the back alleys. The State came in and took care of that for us but the State also fined us \$10,000 and said unless we establish a fund we would have to pay the fines from the State.

Chairman O'Neil asked is \$10,000 going to do it or do you need the \$15,000.

Chief Kane answered the request was for \$15,000. I can't tell you for sure whether it is going to cut it or not. We may need more or less but that was the suggested figure from the State.

Chairman O'Neil asked did you say we did get fined or the State threatened to fine us \$10,000.

Chief Kane answered the State threatened to fine us \$10,000.

Alderman Lopez moved to refer this item to the public hearing.

Chairman O'Neil asked the \$10,000 that the Mayor recommended or their request for \$15,000.

Alderman Lopez stated the only way I can find \$5,000 is from that \$65,000.

Chairman O'Neil replied okay then we will refer it as is per the Mayor's recommendation at \$10,000.

Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea asked is that 411103 Fire Department Hazardous Material. Is that what we are talking about here?

Chairman O'Neil answered yes.

Alderman Shea stated that is in this budget.

Chairman O'Neil replied only \$10,000.

Alderman Shea asked so you want another \$5,000. We can put it up to \$15,000.

Chairman O'Neil stated we will refer it as the Mayor's request.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated we have two different things going on here. I think Alderman Shea thought it was going up to \$15,000. The motion as I understand it is to maintain it at \$10,000 until the public hearing.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to refer this item at \$10,000 to the public hearing. There being none opposed, the motion carried. While we have you here can you bring us up-to-date on the work you have been doing with the



fire station? At one point we were at \$3 million. You got that number down to \$2.2 million; therefore, you are only requesting \$700,000 this year to build the fire station. Is that correct, Chief?

Deputy Chief Monnelly replied that is correct. Our original request was for \$3 million. In the process of working through that project with the architects...he hired a construction manager to go out and come up with prices for us so we could do our CIP funding for this year. That construction manager brought back a cost of about \$2.7 million to complete the structure. At that point we had a meeting with yourself, the Mayor, the Chief and we felt that that figure was way too high and we went back and took a look at what the building looked like, what we could do to cut costs and we sat down with C&K Architects and went through the process. We feel that we have the building down to a little bit more manageable figure now at \$2.2 million. Now we currently have \$1.5 million that was given to us for this current fiscal year and in the Mayor's CIP budget there is \$700,000 to finish this project. We feel that we can fall under that mark to do that this year.

Alderman Wihby asked when do you expect this to be completed.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered the initial report from the architect says nine months from the time that they begin work on the station. We have not even gone out to bid yet. We are prepared to go out to bid.

Alderman Wihby asked will that be in the 2004 budget.

Chairman O'Neil stated one of the things in my discussions with the department is they are ready to go out for bid. They believe the \$2.2 million number is a good number but we just have to give them a little...if it comes in at \$2.3 million that is not because they didn't do any hard work on it but just what the market is...

Alderman Wihby interjected are you looking to fund the staff in the FY04 budget.

Chief Kane stated actually what we are looking to do is in our last conversation with the Mayor and his staff we were looking at a May 15 opening day.

Alderman Wihby asked May 15, 2003.

Chief Kane answered yes.

Alderman Wihby asked but you don't have any money in your budget for that do you.

Chief Kane answered that is absolutely correct. The Mayor has not put that money in there. We are going to be looking from the Board as to when they would like to see that station opening up and we are looking for some guidance here.

Alderman Wihby asked what is the cost going to be for a year for that station.

Chief Kane answered about \$660,000 for staff and another \$154,000 for operational costs.

Alderman Wihby asked so about \$800,000 a year to fund that on an ongoing basis.

Chief Kane answered for 12 months.

Alderman Wihby asked and you are going to be coming probably to this Board in the budget process looking for a couple of months worth of that.

Chief Kane answered yes.

Alderman Shea stated I didn't quite get the whole conversation. What were you asking again, Alderman Wihby?

Alderman Wihby replied well the construction is going to be completed, I am being told, in mid-May and there is no money in the budget to put anybody in it. So, either you are not going to open it until July 1 anyway, which would be the FY04 budget or they are going to come back to us this year in the budget process to look for two month's worth or 1/6 of \$800,000 or another \$125,000 or so in order to man it from May 15.

Alderman Shea stated the other part is they have set aside \$1.5 million and you are asking for another \$700,000 to go out to bid is that what you are saying.

Deputy Chief Monnelly replied that is correct, Alderman.

Alderman Shea asked and that is already in this particular budget right here.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered yes it is.

Alderman Shea stated so what you are really cutting down is the cost of future appropriations is that correct.

Chairman O'Neil replied no what they did cut down was what would have been a request for \$1.5 million this year. They cut it down to \$700,000.

Alderman Shea asked so the \$700,000 was included in the Mayor's proposal.

Chairman answered right. With the Mayor's budget they have enough funding, they believe, to build this facility. The point being made was how they went back and worked to get the number more manageable and I think what they are looking for tonight is the blessing that the Board knows that they are going out for bids to build the fire station and hopefully it comes in at \$2.2 million or less.

Alderman Smith stated we are building a building but we don't have anybody to staff it.

Alderman Gatsas stated I believe that maybe the last Board had said that when any project comes forward there was a sheet to be completed that would show costs for the entire project – staffing, equipment, etc. because you may not have it staffed but you certainly don't have equipment either. What is the equipment cost going to be? You must be looking for the full Board to put the equipment in there.

Chief Kane replied that is correct, Alderman. We were the first project to go through that process.

Alderman Gatsas asked is that in place and it has been distributed.

Chairman O'Neil stated we saw that probably 18 months ago.

Chief Kane stated it was the first project that you saw so it has been out there. We have copies. We do have equipment costs and basically most of the equipment is apparatus. It was \$764,000 for apparatus.

Alderman Gatsas asked so that \$764,000 is that fully equipped.

Chief Kane answered that is for the apparatus. When you say equipment, are you talking about furniture and that type of stuff?

Alderman Gatsas replied if you don't have chairs to sit in, where are they going to sit, in the apparatus.

Chief Kane responded that figure would be part of the construction costs.

Alderman Gatsas asked so the total apparatus cost is \$764,000 and the total labor for the year or actually it would have to be 14 months to get you to the next budget cycle...

Chief Kane interjected the apparatus, even if we ordered it tomorrow it takes at least 12-14 months to purchase it. We do have a letter in and I believe that it is going to be coming to the full Board tomorrow.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think Mr. MacKenzie would like to talk about that so let's not jump to other things. Let's focus...we will go back to that I promise you, Alderman Gatsas tonight. Let's just focus on the fire station right now.

Alderman Lopez stated I spoke to the Chief today and Alderman Smith sort of asked the question...I would hate to see and it is a struggling aspect here because we all know that we need a fire station down in the South section but as I told the Chief I would like to see the fire station have the firemen in there. Where we are going to be struggling really bad this year and if that fire station is on line the first of May it is harder to get the funds but as you go through your bid process and everything for the first of July for that fire station to be there then I think you can put a constructive budget together since we have the same Board realizing the fact that we are going forward and doing that. Secondly, Alderman Gatsas brought up a very valid point where the whole project was...I don't recall seeing that whole document but I do know it was brought forward. I think that we can make that decision. The only thing I want to ask the Chief today is to take into consideration some of the comments I just made and maybe get the personnel in the fire station because if we don't have the money and the fire station is there, it will be like McLaughlin School. Where are the teachers and then everybody is scrambling and we get a lot of comments from the community.

Alderman Shea stated the point he raises, does that present a problem to you people in terms of maybe opening it up during the next budget period.

Chief Kane replied obviously we would like to get the station on line as quickly as possible and we are looking for guidance also from the Board. The thought of starting construction and moving the process along and in funding the personnel in next year's budget is obviously something that needs to be brought forward and if that is the wishes of the Board then obviously that is what we will do. What that will probably entail is just doing construction for a short period of time and instead of looking at a target date of opening up in May we would be looking at a date in FY04.

Alderman Shea asked do you have the necessary personnel in training or applying to the Fire Department to be able to staff the fire station. Is that a problem or are there a lot of candidates out there?

Chief Kane answered currently we are involved in the testing process and we do this every two years whether it be a new station or not. We always maintain an

eligibility list. On the current one there are like 25 people and on the projected one there are, I believe, 130 applicants who are applying to take the test.

Alderman Shea asked so personnel are not a problem.

Chief Kane answered finding personnel is not a problem.

Alderman Wihby asked, Chief, in the budget process the Mayor assumed that you weren't going to have any staff before July 1 and went ahead and gave you the building but not the staff figuring you would hire somebody in the next budget cycle. True?

Chief Kane answered in my conversation with him during our budget meetings we were talking about a May 15 opening.

Alderman Wihby asked did he fund you for a May 15 opening.

Chief Kane answered obviously the Mayor had not funded the staff for the May 15 opening and I believe he would have left it up to the Board to make that decision.

Alderman Wihby asked so his recommendation in the CIP budget was not to staff it until July 1. Obviously if the Mayor didn't put a number in the budget for any personnel he is assuming that July 1, 2003 is when you would hire the people.

Chief Kane answered I would hate to speak for the Mayor. I really don't know.

Alderman Wihby stated it would be the FY04 budget but it would be July 1, 2003. He is assuming that you would wait until then to man it. You never had a discussion with the Mayor and he told you he wasn't going to fund the people until the next budget cycle because he told me that he talked to you.

Chief Kane replied he talked to Deputy Chief Monnelly.

Alderman Wihby asked and told you that he wasn't funding it and he expected it to be funded in the following year.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered I spoke to Wayne Robinson last Wednesday prior to the budget coming out and in that conversation he told me that there would be no money in the FY03 budget for firefighters for that station.

Alderman Wihby asked and you agreed that was okay or you didn't agree that it was okay.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered I understood that he said that was what the Mayor was presenting for a budget.

Alderman Wihby asked if you were opening May 15, what is the number that you plan on asking for in the next couple of weeks to the Aldermen that you need to make that work. I assume it would go back to Alderman Gatsas' comments that you need an engine and everything else in there so what number are you looking for? You don't have a sheet there that tells you what you are going to be asking us for in the next week?

Chief Kane replied no we don't.

Alderman Gatsas stated \$904,000 is what he needs. That is the equipment and two months of personnel.

Chairman O'Neil replied don't confuse the apparatus. That is a bond issue, not an operating budget issue.

Chief Kane stated as the Alderman said the equipment is a bonding issue.

Alderman Wihby asked so what about staff. \$150,000 or so?

Chief Kane answered yes.

Alderman Wihby asked so that would be in this year's budget coming up otherwise you wait until July 1.

Chief Kane answered that is correct.

Alderman Wihby asked and what is the big problem about waiting until July 1.

Chief Kane answered it would just be a couple of months.

Alderman Wihby asked so you have no problem waiting until July 1.

Chief Kane answered no.

Chairman O'Neil stated you would open it tomorrow if we gave you the money right.

Chief Kane replied obviously if you gave me the money I would try to open it up as quickly as I possibly could but what we are talking about is taking a longer time for the construction period.

Alderman Gatsas asked the communication that you had with the Mayor was that he was not going to put the money in this budget, however, if you wanted to present it to this Board and the wish of this Board was to fund it, that would be our wish and not his budgeted number.

Chief Kane replied you are absolutely correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated obviously if we have a fire station that was completed and if there was ever a catastrophic in the South end and we don't have bodies there and apparatus, I don't know if we would be doing what we have been elected to do and I think that if that were to happen would you be able to find for a short-term fix 16 bodies if we got the apparatus and moved them from other stations to be in there for that two month period without having to hire new people to affect your budget.

Chief Kane replied during that period of time especially, that would affect our budget. That period of time is high vacation and high overtime so we really wouldn't be able to do something like that during that time of year.

Chairman O'Neil asked just for clarification you also need some lead time because you don't hire someone Day 1 and say you are going to go to a fire station. There is a training period involved correct?

Chief Kane replied that is correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked is it eight or ten weeks.

Chief Kane answered that is correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked so before we say we are going to put somebody in a fire station at a certain date you need eight to ten weeks ahead of that correct.

Chief Kane answered that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated the \$764,000 that we are talking about for bonding does not appear anywhere in this CIP budget.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you want to go to the apparatus right now.

Alderman Gatsas replied where else are we going.

Chairman O'Neil stated well I think they are looking for some kind of blessing from the CIP Committee and then the full Board tomorrow night to go out to bid on the fire station. The drawings are ready but they need some...knowing very well and am I correct that the language is that it is all subject to funding, correct?

Deputy Chief Monnelly replied absolutely.

Chairman O'Neil stated they are not guaranteeing anything. They know that they need the CIP budget to pass with the \$700,000 in it but they are looking to get...you were told by the construction professionals that this was the best time to go out correct?

Chief Kane replied absolutely.

Alderman Gatsas asked are they considering a design-build.

Chairman O'Neil answered it is already designed. I like your thinking but I think it is a little late on this one unfortunately.

Alderman Shea moved to authorize the Fire Department to go out to bid on the Cohas Brook Fire Station with the understanding that the awarding of a contract is subject to approval of the appropriation in the FY2003 CIP budget.

Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil stated okay now let's go to the apparatus that Alderman Gatsas has been talking about. Bob, my understanding is there has been some discussion about how to approach the purchase of the apparatus with it not being included in the Mayor's budget this year.

Mr. MacKenzie replied correct. There are actually two pieces of apparatus requested here. One is what is called a Quint. It serves two roles, both an engine and a ladder. That price tag is roughly \$580,000. The second piece is called a Brush Truck. That smaller price tag is roughly \$160,000 I believe. What is being proposed since the Quint has a fairly big price tag but would not be delivered until roughly May of 2003 would be that we not fund the actual monies because we wouldn't have to give the money until May 2003 that if the Board approves the Cohas Station in the next couple of weeks, we have a contract that is proposed for the Quint. We would get the full Board to approve that contract but not fund it until FY04, which the City has done before. So we could get the truck on order and the truck under construction. It is a legally binding contract and the City



would have to pay for it. Because bonding was so tight this year, that was a way to keep the project on schedule.

Alderman Wihby asked don't we have new Aldermen coming in for that budget.

Mr. MacKenzie answered no.

Alderman Shea asked how many fire apparatus are we going to have there. Is it three or four or two?

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered there would be two.

Alderman Shea asked just two.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered right the Quint and the Brush Truck.

Alderman Shea asked and the more expensive one...there are some that you purchased for \$333,000 but this is...is that the same type that used to be \$333,000 years ago but now went up to \$538,000 or is this a special unit.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered no Sir, this is a combination. This is a pump and it also carries what we call a box beam ladder on the top that is capable of going 65 feet. That will service that area and cover our needs for aerial evacuations for those buildings and the water tower capacity that is out there. Those vehicles do cost more.

Alderman Shea asked you don't have any other kind like that do you. Is that the first of its kind here?

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered it would be the first of its kind here.

Chairman O'Neil stated you do have a similar piece at Hackett Hill. This isn't exactly the same but...

Deputy Chief Monnelly interjected this isn't exactly the same as the one at Hackett Hill. The one at Hackett Hill has a 110' ladder and this one is only going to be a 65' ladder. The cost on this one will be a lot lower than the one for Hackett Hill was.

Chairman O'Neil asked but conceptually it is the same theory behind it.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered that is correct. It can pump water. It can put up ladders. It can put up an aerial for the building and retrieve people from the third floor with no problem.

Chairman O'Neil stated in my conversation with you one of the several days that I grilled you, Chief Monnelly, was that this Brush Truck made sense because we, especially in high wood and grass fire season we have a tendency to run \$400,000 pieces into the woods to try to put out fires correct.

Deputy Chief Monnelly replied that is correct. We do the best we can to keep them out of the woods but in the interest of life safety sometimes we do have to put them in harm's way and it just doesn't make any sense to put a \$400,000 fire truck out in the middle of the woods to put out a brush fire when we can take a \$100,000 Brush Truck and put it out there and do no damage to it.

Alderman Gatsas asked so one truck is \$580,000 that we are going to wait and bond later. The other one is \$160,000. Are we bonding that now? There are no other vehicles and no other equipment that you need? There is nothing else needed that that fire station and when I say equipment there is no...

Deputy Chief Monnelly stated the base price of the Quint is \$585,000 and the equipment that will go on that vehicle is \$72,000. The cost of that Quint will be \$657,000.

Alderman Gatsas asked and what is the cost of the other apparatus.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered the Brush Truck is \$107,500 and that is equipped.

Alderman Gatsas asked when you say equipped that is all the firefighter's gear and everything.

Deputy Chief Monnelly answered that is without the protective clothing. That is usually in our regular operating budget.

Alderman Gatsas asked is that part of the \$150,000 that we were talking about for May, June and July or not when I asked about all equipment.

Chairman O'Neil stated their gear is included in the regular operating budget.

Deputy Chief Monnelly replied that is correct. That is where we take it from. Turn out gear comes from our operating budget. We never fund for it here Alderman.

Alderman Gatsas responded right but let's make it a little clearer so that everybody understands. The first assumption for employees was 12 to 16 employees.

Chief Kane replied 16.

Alderman Gatsas stated the cost of those 16 employees was about \$800,000. Is that correct?

Chief Kane replied that is correct for the total year.

Alderman Gatsas asked now does that include equipment or not. Is that just wages?

Chief Kane answered that is wages.

Alderman Gatsas asked so if I took the \$800,000 and divided that by 12 we are somewhere in the vicinity of let's call it \$70,000 a month so you need \$140,000 for those two months.

Chief Kane answered that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked what else do we need to equip the station and not furnishings, so that the firefighters have everything they need for their accommodations.

Chief Kane answered all other equipment that we would need would come out of our normal operating budget.

Alderman Gatsas stated but we have to put it in because you can't get it because you don't have that in your operating budget for the 16 new people unless I am wrong.

Chairman O'Neil stated I know where he is going with this. We are only talking about salaries and there are some additional...like benefits if we are talking \$140,000 it has to be probably another \$40,000 on top of that.

Chief Kane stated the turn out gear is about \$16,000. It would be about \$1,000 per person.

Alderman Gatsas asked and then that station is ready to go.

Chief Kane answered that is correct.

Alderman Wihby asked is there anywhere in the City where you wish you had a bigger ladder. What is the biggest we got?

Chief Kane answered the 110' ladder.

Alderman Wihby asked is that sufficient for the City.

Chief Kane answered yes. The ladders that start going a lot higher than that, the costs are doubled and they become less functional. The problem is mobility and set-up time. Basically the biggest ladder...they are all around 100' or 110' or 106'.

Alderman Wihby asked is there a ladder in some area that isn't sufficient.

Chief Kane answered no.

Alderman Lopez asked, Chief, in looking at the City as a whole is this the last fire station at this present time.

Chief Kane answered it is the last new station. We are looking to rebuild the station up on Hackett Hill in the future. Obviously, that...you wouldn't need equipment there and you wouldn't need manpower because all of that manpower is still there but the Hackett Hill station is basically a trailer. It was supposed to last five or six years. We are on our second trailer up there. We are waiting basically for the design of that whole area up there to look to find out where we would put a fire station. This is the last remote area in the City in regards to new stations.

Alderman Lopez asked if Mr. MacKenzie and the Chief and everybody else can work it out, I would like a complete factual sheet of all the costs so that we can make the determination when the time comes.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think it is pretty obvious that we are going to be talking about manpower during the operating budget discussions so I am sure you are already getting ready for that, Chief.

Chief Kane replied right. We had anticipated an expanded discussion during the operational budget meeting.

Alderman Smith asked how many people would you be servicing down in that area. Do you know how many houses or families?

Chief Kane answered no, I don't. Bob, do you have any idea about what is in that Southeast section?

Mr. MacKenzie stated there are roughly a little over 2,000 dwelling units in that area. Some of those are multi-family on Bodwell Road. Probably a majority are single family homes.

Alderman Smith asked there are no double or triple-deckers.

Mr. MacKenzie answered correct.

Chief Kane stated there is a group of 24 unit buildings out there though.

Chairman O'Neil stated I don't think we need to take any other action. We voted to recommend to the full Board tomorrow night that you go forward with going out to bid subject to approval of the CIP budget. We will have manpower and equipment discussions during the operating budget and I guess at some point we will have to get an action of the Board to move forward with the recommendation on how to purchase the main piece of apparatus for out there. The \$107,000, I believe, is included in the Mayor's motorized equipment number under bonds. There are a number of actions that need to happen for you down the road a little bit but at least you will get the green light after tomorrow night to hopefully go out to bid.

Deputy Clerk Johnson asked is the \$107,000 piece of equipment being referred to the staff to come back.

Chairman O'Neil answered no. That is included in the Mayor's motorized equipment account under bonds.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a reason why the Mayor would have bonded the \$107,000 if he wasn't going to man the station. If he put the equipment in for bonding, why didn't he put the people in?

Alderman Wihby answered because he is assuming that it will open July 1.

Chairman O'Neil stated they still need lead time, even on the less expensive piece, to get it bought.

Alderman Gatsas asked who assumed that it was going to open July 1.

Chairman O'Neil answered I don't think any of us should assume anything. Someone needs to have a discussion with the Mayor, I think.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Chief, did you assume it was going to open July 1.

Alderman Wihby stated I just want to set the record straight. The Mayor told me that he met with you and I don't know which one of you but somebody in the Fire Department and told you that he was funding the building but he wasn't funding the people until the following budget. I asked him what you guys said and he said you said you were fine with that if they open July 1. I don't know why you would be coming to us to man the station in May and June if you told him okay and he didn't put it in his budget.

Chief Kane replied we weren't really coming here for the manpower tonight. The point was to come here to get approval to go out to bid.

Alderman Wihby asked but am I to anticipate that you are going to come forward looking for the staff for May and June.

Chief Kane answered we are going to have a discussion.

Alderman Wihby asked so you are coming looking for additional staff funding for May and June. Can I get a yes or a no? After you told the Mayor you were fine with July 1, you are still going to come to the Aldermen looking to put positions on before July 1. Is that a yes or a no? I would hate to see that you told the Mayor that you would wait until July 1 and then throw it in the laps of the Aldermen to decide what is going on. The Fire Department wouldn't do that to the Aldermen would they?

Chief Kane answered absolutely not.

Alderman Wihby asked so you are not coming forward asking for funding for May and June.

Chief Kane answered I am always looking for guidance.

Alderman Shea stated we can always put off approving the building to coincide with the fact that it would have to open up July 1. We don't want to put you in a compromising situation and we don't want to look like the bad guys and we don't want the Mayor coming out smelling like a rose here for dumping the project on us. Basically, we have to get together and get a firm commitment or consistent commitment from you people saying in essence you are going to tell us the same

thing you told the Mayor, which would be that you would not plan on opening this facility until July 1 with personnel.

Chairman O'Neil asked did you request additional personnel in your budget to the Mayor.

Chief Kane answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked so you did request money to open the station earlier than July 1.

Chief Kane answered yes.

Alderman Shea asked and he said no.

Chief Kane answered correct.

Alderman Wihby asked and he asked you if you would back that to July 1 and you said yes.

Chief Kane answered he did not speak to me directly. Last week I was out of town. He spoke to Deputy Chief Monnelly and he said that that is what he was going to do and we said okay.

Chairman O'Neil stated there is a difference between the Mayor saying that is what he is going to do and you are just confirming then agreeing to that is what they wanted. We don't need to beat this thing up tonight.

Alderman Gatsas stated my understanding is from when I brought you back a little while ago right after Alderman Wihby's position was that you made a presentation to the Mayor for those employees. He said he wasn't going to fund them in his budget but if you had your choice you could come to the full Board and plead your case.

Chief Kane replied the last part of that statement he did not say. He just said that he was not funding it in this year's budget. I would assume that given that every department has an opportunity to come before the Board to make a presentation that this would come up during that presentation.

Alderman DeVries asked can you tell me air packs and such, is that already included in the budget. I know we already talked about apparatus and protective gear.

Chief Kane answered right. That is usually part of the apparatus.

Alderman DeVries asked you are taking that out of your operating funds in case you do open ahead of schedule.

Chief Kane answered usually the air packs and that type of stuff come with the apparatus.

Alderman DeVries asked and your operating budget was increased...the request was increased this year for FY2003 over last year. Is that because of the Wellness Program and such? Will we see a presentation?

Chairman O'Neil asked is that an operating budget question. Can we save that?

Chief Kane answered I am not really prepared to answer that question tonight.

- c) communication from Donald Clay, former MTA General Manager, relative to the MTA's request for funding

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby it was voted to receive and file this item.

- d) Traffic Committee referral regarding the Pearl Street Parking Lot.

Chairman O'Neil asked Tom Lolicata and Ron Ludwig to come forward.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to make it clear and I am confused as to why Parks is involved in this particular parking lot and why we have benches over there where nobody can sit down and if this parking lot could be...well answer the first question. Who is responsible for this parking lot? Traffic or is it a combination?

Mr. Lolicata replied the parking lot is Traffic.

Alderman Lopez asked and Parks has nothing to do with it, correct.

Mr. Lolicata answered we work with them on some projects once and awhile.

Alderman Lopez asked like what.

Mr. Lolicata answered say we want to ask for a bench or a small project like for landscaping or something like that.



Alderman Lopez asked so if we just made it strictly a parking lot, period, without any trees or benches then it would be your responsibility.

Mr. Lolicata answered right.

Alderman Lopez stated I have a question for Mr. MacKenzie. If we looked at this parking lot as strictly economic development I was wondering if you could comment or look at that if this were strictly an economic development and we would not put any park benches or trees in there. Is it a possibility to fund it or look at it in that particular area?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I guess there are two parts to that. One is could you do the area without the park benches? Yes, you could. You could keep it simple and pave those areas or just keep some grass. The second part of the question is could it be funded within the program and I guess it came down to the fact that there was extremely limited bond money this year and in the Mayor's proposal they did not include money for upgrading the parking lot.

Alderman Lopez asked isn't there a fund someplace for economic development that had \$600,000 or \$700,000 in it.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes there is a fund called the CBDRF, Central Business District Revitalization Fund. Those are primarily monies that are paid back from the Center of New Hampshire project where Federal funds were used and the Federal funds say that if money is returned you have to use it for the same type of project for economic development. I couldn't answer you as to whether this parking lot was economic development. If there was a new project going up that needed parking, I think you could perhaps argue that. I am not sure if you could just to reconstruct and existing parking lot.

Alderman Lopez asked but it is an area for discussion right. Would you agree with that?

Mr. MacKenzie answered the Committee could have us look at that. I would normally talk to Sam who was around when the fund was started and perhaps check with HUD.

Alderman Lopez stated the only reason I bring this up, Mr. Chairman is to point out that this parking lot is used constantly and people have...how many passes or monthly permits are there.

Mr. Lolicata replied there are over 300 cars there.

Alderman Lopez stated this parking lot is always filled and it is in the most deplorable condition probably in the entire City.

Chairman O'Neil asked Deputy Clerk Johnson to verify what the Traffic Committee referred. It is not construction, it is maintenance, correct?

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the Traffic Committee sent this to the CIP Committee because it is an issue of maintenance. The issue was first initiated by a letter from Mr. Cardin, which we had enclosed in the agenda. He is basically talking about litter being scattered, boundaries not being picked up, maintained or swept, dog fouling and those types of issues. It is not really an issue of construction or paving or anything like that. It is the maintenance and it was our understanding at the Traffic Committee's level or the Committee's understanding that there were no funds available to keep up with the maintenance of this parking lot, either in Parks & Recreation or on the Traffic Department's side. I guess that was the major reason it was sent to CIP in the first place.

Alderman Smith stated I visited this site two or three times and I know the benches have been repaired. There is a sign that says "no dog fouling." The catch basin has been repaired. The only thing that is missing is the traffic island where the curbing is eroding and so isn't the asphalt pavement. I think we have a weed program in June and probably they can go up there and address the weeds growing up through the asphalt curbing.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Tom, can you talk to Frank Thomas about fixing the curb.

Mr. Lolicata stated what happened this past year is the maintenance is a big problem and this goes into reconstruction after a while. My men, every Monday morning and every Friday afternoon when they have a chance, go over to that parking lot because of all the clubs over there. It is a pigpen. It has been this way for two and a half years. We put barrels down there. The hot top is coming up. We had an annual parking facilities fund running here, which was not funded this year. The Pearl Street Lot was going to be coming up in that agenda for \$100,000 worth of work. Unless there is something going on that the Board knows about for future plans for the Pearl Lot...maybe that is why we didn't get the money this year. I have no idea. Maintenance is your problem.

Chairman O'Neil asked you are sending people over there regularly and the majority of items, according to Alderman Smith, have been corrected. The outstanding items are curbing and some asphalt. Can you ask Frank to send a crew over there to do half a day's work to fix it?

Mr. Lolicata answered yes that is probably all that needs to be done right now.

Chairman O'Neil stated and then everything is pretty much up to snuff, correct.

Mr. Lolicata replied there is a lot of work to be done in that parking lot, but those complaints that you see in front of you have been taken care of.

Chairman O'Neil stated that is what we are referencing. We are not referencing a new capital project. All we are referencing are the maintenance issues.

Mr. Lolicata replied these maintenance issues have been addressed.

Chairman O'Neil asked other than the curbing.

Mr. Lolicata answered correct.

Alderman Wihby asked the annual maintenance you said wasn't funded in the budget. The budget we are in or the budget next year or both?

Mr. Lolicata answered I didn't see anything in FY03 for the annual parking program.

Alderman Wihby asked did you have anything in FY02.

Mr. Lolicata answered yes we did. It was mostly for Victory. I believe we put in for \$1,222,000 and I think the Pearl Lot was going to be \$100,000 worth of work roughly.

Alderman Wihby asked what did you have this year.

Mr. Lolicata answered \$600,000 for Victory I believe.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that sounds right.

Alderman Wihby asked what did you normally have for maintenance though, \$100,000.

Mr. Lolicata answered it varies from year to year because of the garages, the bonding and the jobs that come up. It could be \$1 million one year, \$250,000 the next year.

Alderman Wihby asked and this year there is nothing.

Mr. Lolicata answered this year we put in for over \$1 million worth of work of which \$100,000 was going to go towards the Pearl Lot.

Alderman Wihby asked and you got zero.

Mr. Lolicata answered zero.

Chairman O'Neil stated let's focus on what the Traffic Committee requested. Just maintenance issues. We can receive and file this communication tonight knowing that you have taken care of a majority of the items and that you are going to work with Highway to correct the curbing and asphalt over there. Is that correct? We could receive and file and the maintenance issues will be corrected?

Mr. Lolicata replied correct.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to receive and file this item.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Resolution that was forwarded read from FY2003 to FY2007. The Mayor's capital plan includes the FY03 but also he has an eight-year capital plan so we are requesting that the end date be changed to 2010.

Chairman O'Neil asked that doesn't change anything else in the Resolution.

Mr. MacKenzie answered no it does not.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to amend the Resolution to read "WHEREAS the Board of Mayor and Aldermen has reviewed the 2003 to 2010 Community Improvement Program."

Alderman Shea stated what I would like to suggest so that we might be able to help everyone who is asking like the Boy's and Girl's Club is possibly asking the different non-profits to maybe think about a reduction in the...how would I word this, the people that are the United Way are cutting back on the amount of money that they are giving to different agencies so my thought is that if we could ask several of these to cut back a little bit, maybe 1% or something, then maybe we could find enough money to help out all of the agencies or 2%. Do they submit these requests to you, Bob, and you forward them? I would like to ask them to resubmit their request predicating on a 1% or 2% basis and then explain in your letter to them that we have had numerous requests because of cutbacks and we would like to be able to help equally all possible agencies of a non-profit nature. Maybe I am stealing the thunder from Alderman Wihby over here, I am not sure, because he is going to do that in the regular budget. I think it is only fair that we

try to do that so if you could do that it would be appreciated. I am not sure if other members of the Committee agree.

Alderman Smith asked can somebody clarify for me what the Destination Manchester Coordinator is so I can get my feet wet.

Chairman O'Neil answered that is Mr. Jabjiniak.

Alderman Smith stated he is getting \$82,000. I will have to talk with him then. It is a new position.

Chairman O'Neil replied not it isn't. It is a couple of years old.

Alderman Lopez stated I think Mr. MacKenzie can answer that better than I but there are a lot of positions that can be funded, and Bill Jabjiniak is one of them and the grant writer is another one, out of CDBG money. If you want to elaborate, Mr. MacKenzie, as to how that works.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I do want to get back to Alderman Shea's question but let me go to this one now. Typically for new initiatives sometimes funds are put in the CIP program to test out to see if the program is going to work and typically that is a three-year period that a test is run. That is why the Mayor is proposing a grant writer this year. Last year he proposed that there be a Destination Manchester Coordinator. Typically they run three years and if it is a worthwhile program then they are moved into the operating budget. If I can move on to Alderman Shea's question, in essence all of the non-profits asked for more money then they received. Virtually all non-profits were level funded so unlike some of the City departments there has been a zero increase in almost all of the non-profit agencies given the budget situation that the City is facing. Almost all of them were level funded.

Alderman Shea responded well so were the departments in the City level funded for the most part and obviously we are going to have to find ways of cutting back on the 10.6 or whatever the amount is so what I am saying is that many of the non-profits were given less money. One example is the Boy's and Girl's Club because the United Way didn't raise as much money so they are cutting back 25% according to what Mr. Neil said. In lieu of that, even though they are level funded, we could probably say to them in essence we are running a difficult budget and we are asking for your support in trying to help us meet our obligations to help people who have taken a substantial loss by receiving 25% less than they normally get. I don't think we are asking them to do anything...you know they are non-profits and we are helping them even though they asked for more and we gave them level funding. Still in all we can say help us out because we have been good to you. In

essence, as a community we can say hey we are not even going to give you anything. I wouldn't want to do that but I am just saying that we are helping them and we have helped them in the past but we are trying to help other agencies. I am not sure and I don't know whether the other members of the Committee agree or disagree. I am in favor of asking that.

Alderman Lopez stated most of these agencies are asking for the minimum. For example, Alliance for Community Support, \$5,000 has been given to them for as long as I can remember. Another thing that you have to remember is why we are giving them the money. In most cases, it is to assist the people who are either hard on the State, Federal and working in a social area in a health program in order to supplement their particular budget if you want to call it that or operating expense for that particular program. If we cut, let's say we are going to cut the \$5,000 from the Alliance for Community Support. There might not be any person who is in charge of that because that is not enough money and they can't get it any place else so 120 to 180 youth that they serve annually...that program might be out the window and I think it would end up costing us more. The idea and philosophy that you would like to see in asking them to cut back, there is nothing wrong with that but I think that Mr. MacKenzie and his staff have been through this thoroughly as you will see when they provide us with all the requests. Each request is scrutinized by his staff and I am sure that if there is any one program that you really want to go after, I am sure his staff could sit down and get the information requested. It is a lot more work for them to do right now. If there is any one in particular that you are interested in, I am sure they could sit down and show you exactly how the program works.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it is a lot of work. There are 30 non-profit agencies that we would have to notify. We would probably have to meet with each of them to talk about what the Board is looking for. We are talking about a couple of hundred hours of staff time. We will do that if the Committee wishes us to but there is limited time.

Alderman Shea stated what I find kind of difficult to understand is a year ago on the West side there wasn't a program for the Boy's and Girl's Club. Today he mentioned that there are over 200 children going there. Well where did they go before? I am not being uncharitable or unreasonable but when I listen to all of the different agencies servicing children...you know it is like there is duplication sometimes. In other words, you have so many youth in the City and everyone is giving so much of their time and effort and energy towards helping kids but where are all the kids coming from? Where were these kids being serviced before this opened up? There must have been some agency that was servicing them that is losing kids to the Boy's and Girl's Club. It stands to reason and I am not picking on any one. I am just saying that...it is wonderful to have a Kid's Café at the

Salvation Army yet there are several agencies that work for the Salvation Army in order to help them. I am saying instead of \$14,300 maybe they can go with \$13,000 or something and give the \$1,300 to the Boy's and Girl's Club or something. That is all I am asking. I am not saying they are going to do that but I am just saying maybe they could help out in that regard. I am not disagreeing with a \$5,000 appropriation. We are not asking them to close shop. What I am saying is there are certain agencies that we see more than \$5,000 for and maybe if we could ask them to round off the numbers maybe we could find enough to help the Boy's and Girl's Club. That is all I am suggesting. It doesn't hurt. If the members of the Committee agree, fine. If they don't, well they don't.

Alderman Shea moved to request that the Planning Director send a memo to the non-profit organizations asking them to resubmit their budget requests showing how a 1% and 2% cut would affect them.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I think he is talking about doing the same thing, in essence as you do with departments. He is really looking to know what the cause and effects of a 1% and 2% cut would be.

Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby stated again we don't have it in front of us but let's assume that somebody asked for \$20,000 and the Mayor gave them \$15,000. Are you going to ask them 1% from the Mayor's number? So we are going to let them know what the Mayor gave them and ask them what a 1% or 2% cut would mean?

Alderman Shea replied yes.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee